REMARKS

The Official Action mailed April 26, 2010, has been received and its contents carefully noted. Filed concurrently herewith is a *Request for Three Month Extension of Time*, which extends the shortened statutory period for response to October 26, 2010. Also, filed concurrently herewith is a *Request for Continued Examination*. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicant notes with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on June 9, 2006, and September 18, 2006.

A further Information Disclosure Statement is submitted herewith and consideration of this Information Disclosure Statement is respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 6, 8 and 9 are pending in the present application, all of which are independent. Claims 4, 6, 8 and 9 have been amended to better recite the features of the present invention. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Paragraph 4 of the Official Action rejects claims 4, 6, 8 and 9 as obvious based on the combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,550,896 to Chavez and U.S. Patent No. 6,212,390 to Rune. The Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained against the independent claims of the present application, as amended.

As stated in MPEP §§ 2142-2144.04, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some reason, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some reason to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally

available to one of ordinary skill in the art. "The test for an implicit showing is what the combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." In re Kotzab, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000). See also In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

The prior art, either alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest all the features of the independent claims, as amended. Independent claims 4, 6, 8 and 9 have been amended to recite "the identification information not having information of a home site," which is supported in the present specification, for example, by page 37, line 24, to page 38, line 5, as follows (emphasis added):

> Thus, the mobile communication system in this embodiment does not require each site to have the identification information on mobile communication terminals registered with other sites. Therefore, an increase in system resource can be prevented. The mobile communication terminals, in turn, do not need to manage information indicating with which site they are registered. Therefore, an extension of the identification information assigned to the mobile communication terminals can be avoided. In addition, an increase in the number of sites will not cause a deadlock in the identification number assignment plan.

Also, there are numerous examples of the home site disclosed throughout the present specification.

For the reasons provided below, Chavez and Rune, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above-referenced features of the present invention.

Chavez discloses the following: "If the authentication information is not found within the authentication hierarchical structure, switching node 110 utilizes the resident switching node number to route through the switching node hierarchy to switching node 108 requesting the authentication information for PCS telephone 168" (column 3, lines 18-23). That is, in Chavez, a path is determined by a "resident switching node number."

Also, Chavez discloses the following: "Switching node 110 continues to store the authentication information even if PCS telephone 168 subsequentially re-registers on switching node 108" (column 3, lines 33-35). "The mobility management application records in the internal table that PCS telephone 168 is registered on switching node 110" (column 4, lines 59-61). "If switching node 110 determines that PCS telephone 168 should no longer be registered, the mobility management application transmits a message to that effect to the mobility management application of switching node 108. That mobility management application removes the designation in entry 512 to switching node 110" (Column 11, lines 11-18).

According to above descriptions in Chavez, the mobile management application processing is to be performed in the switching node 108. The switching node 108 is being used as a home location. In Chavez, if access has been made at a location other than a home location, then authentication information is stored at a destination, and information indicating the location of the destination is stored at the home.

As a result, in Chavez, processing is performed for the purpose of identifying where a person is located when the person is called. Also, a mechanism is adopted whereby, when the registration has been canceled at the destination, the calculation of the registration is stored at the home.

In Chavez, a detailed description of the layer structure is provided at column 5, line 17, to column 8, line 3 (Figure 4); whereas, the present invention is directed to paths of inquiries.

The present invention has at least the following technical advantageous effects:

- It is unnecessary to cause each of sites to have identification information of a mobile communication terminal which is registered in another site;

- It is unnecessary that information indicating in what site the registration is made should be managed on the side of a mobile communication terminal.

- It is sufficient that the directory server 120 has only information for another directory server located above or below in a directory information tree.

Thus, it is one objective of the present invention to decrease, as much as possible, information held in a system.

In the present invention, since identification information does not include information about a site, a method is adopted whereby information is successively (one after another) accessed above or below in a directory information tree. Such method is not taught or suggested by Chavez.

The Applicant respectfully submits that Rune, which is relied upon to allegedly teach "prohibiting or restricting provision of service ... if it is determined by signaling between the server ... and the wireless terminal that it is outside a particular zone" (page 4, Paper No. 20090929), does not cure the deficiencies in Chavez. The Applicant respectfully submits that Chavez and Rune, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest, among other features discussed above, the identification information not having information of a home site.

Since Chavez and Rune do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are in order and respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17, 1.20(a), 1.20(b), 1.20(c), and 1.20(d) (except the Issue Fee) which may be required now or hereafter, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2280.

Respectfully submitted,

Eric J. Robinson
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.
3975 Fair Ridge Drive
Suite 20 North
Fairfax, Virginia 22033
(571) 434-6789